

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,666	O'HARA, CASEY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kennedy Schaetzle	3762	

All Participants:
Status of Application: allowed

 (1) Kennedy Schaetzle.

(3) _____.

 (2) Steven Mitchell.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 September 2005
Time: 1 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 N/A

Claims discussed:
 N/A

Prior art documents discussed:
 N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
 See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner again informed the applicant of the poor quality of facsimile transmissions received by the Office and particularly those associated with the amendment submitted June 27, 2005 (note page 5 of the Office Action mailed March 1, 2005). The examiner suggested the applicant resubmit a clean copy of the June 27th amendment either by refaxing the amendment using a different machine, or by mail, to avoid transcribing the numerous resultant typographical errors to the published patent.